

Application No: 10/773,225
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3116

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 17 are independent.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Chou at the personal interview held October 15, 2007, are appreciated. The courtesies subsequently extended to Applicant's representative by Supervisor Pham in promptly providing Applicant's representative with a copy of an Interview Summary are especially appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

In section 1 on page 2, the Office Action objects to the Specification for the specified reasons. The offending language is deleted from the Specification by this Amendment. For at least the foregoing reason, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

In section 2 on pages 2-4, the Office Action rejects claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection specifies two recitations in the claims that were not clear to the Examiner. First, the Office Action states, "it is not clear what is the definition of "links" in this context." The Office Action goes on to say that, "Examiner interprets the "length of prefixes" as the "number of bits of prefixes", that is an integer."

During the personal interview, Applicant confirmed for the Examiner that the Examiner's interpretation is correct. Applicant pointed out that support for this interpretation appears

Application No: 10/773,225
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3116

throughout the Specification. Applicant thanks Examiner Chou for memorializing this aspect of the personal interview in the Interview Summary noting that the reference in the Interview Summary to, "the final page (page 3) of the Action" includes a typographical error and should have referred to the final paragraph of page 3 of the action.

The second area of confusion detailed in the rejection at the top of page 4 pertains to the meaning of the term "intersecting" in the claims. Applicant explained to the Examiner during the personal interview that the term intersecting as recited in the claims is identical to the common meaning of the word intersecting in mathematics where the intersection of two sets A and B is the set that contains all the elements of A that also belong to B or equivalently all the elements of B that also belong to A, but no other elements. Applicant pointed out to the Examiner that in set theory an intersection is indicated by the \cap symbol and appears as such in the Specification in Figure 2.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the opportunity to clear up the Examiner's points of confusion regarding subject matter recited in the claims, as supported by the written description in the Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that every term appearing in all of the claims is properly enabled by the written description according to an ordinary level of skill in the art to which the claims pertain.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-22 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement be withdrawn. Should this rejection be maintained, Applicant requests that the Examiner specify with particularity the subject matter recited in the claims allegedly not in compliance with the enablement requirement.

Application No: 10/773,225
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3116

Further, should the Examiner maintain this rejection with respect to subject matter in the claims not previously mentioned in the existing rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that an Office Action containing such a rejection be non-final because Applicant was not given the opportunity to respond to such a rejection at this time.

Applicant further notes that no prior art rejection of the claims is included in the Office Action. The claims are not amended. Thus, should one or more prior art rejections be included in a subsequent Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests that the subsequent Office Action be a non-final Office Action on the grounds that such rejection(s) could have been included in the present Office Action.


CONCLUSION

While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Application No: 10/773,225
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3116

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Mark R. Woodall
Registration No.: 43,286

Date: October 31, 2007

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802